UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

REGINALD CLEMENT,

: CASE NO. 1:13-CV-00389

Petitioner,

:

v. : OPINION & ORDER

[Resolving Doc. No. 1]

BENNIE KELLY, Warden,

:

Respondent.

JAMES S. GWIN, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE:

On September 24, 2013, Magistrate Judge Vecchiarelli recommended the Court dismiss Petitioner Clement's petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. On October 4, 2013, Petitioner moved to extend the time within which to file objections to the Report and Recommendation. On October 8, 2013, the Court granted the motion for additional time and ordered Petitioner to object to the Report and Recommendation by November 8, 2013. Petitioner Clement did not file an objection. The Court now **ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Vecchiarelli's well-reasoned Report and Recommendation and **DISMISSES WITH PREJUDICE** the petition.

The Federal Magistrates Act requires a district court to conduct a *de novo* review only of those portions of a Report and Recommendation to which the parties have made objected.^{4/} Failure to object within the time authorized by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or other court order

 $[\]frac{1}{2}$ Doc. 10.

 $[\]frac{2}{2}$ Doc. 11.

 $[\]frac{3}{2}$ Doc. 12.

⁴/₂₈ U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Case: 1:13-cv-00389-JG Doc #: 13 Filed: 11/14/13 2 of 2. PageID #: 1816

Case No. 1:13-CV-00389

Gwin, J.

waives a party's right to appeal the Magistrate Judge's recommendation. If neither party objects

to the Report and Recommendation, a district court may adopt it without review. 61 However, this

Court has conducted its own review of the petition and traverse^{2/2} and agrees with the conclusions of

the Magistrate Judge.

Accordingly, the Court ADOPTS in whole Magistrate Judge Vecchiarelli's Report and

Recommendation. The Court **DISMISSES WITH PREJUDICE** Clement's § 2254 petition.

Moreover, the Court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that an appeal from this decision

could not be taken in good faith, and no basis exists upon which to issue a certificate of

appealability.8/

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 14, 2013

James S. Gwin

JAMES S. GWIN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

⁵/See Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 147-55 (1985); United States v. Walters, 638 F.2d 947, 949-50 (6th Cir. 1981).

^{6/}*Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 149.

 $[\]frac{7}{5}$ See Docs. 1, 9.

^{8/28} U.S.C. § 2253(c); Fed. R. App. P. 22(b).